

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,774	12/29/2003	Kristine B. Fuimaono	51638/AW/W112	6472
23363 7590 11/15/2007 CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068			EXAMINER	
			BOUCHELLE, LAURA A	
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	A mulicométa)				
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/747,774	FUIMAONO, KRISTINE B.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Laura A. Bouchelle	3763				
The Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this communication app ly	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHICHEVI - Extensions o after SIX (6) - If NO period - Failure to rep Any reply rec earned pater	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAIN IN THE MAILING DAI	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 September 2007</u> .						
′ =	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
• —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of	Claims		•				
4)⊠ Clain	4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.						
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
·	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
•	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.						
	n(s) is/are objected to. n(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement					
O) Ciairi	are subject to restriction and/or	Cicolion requirement.					
Application Pa	apers						
, ——	pecification is objected to by the Examine						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
	eferences Cited (PTO-892) raftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)					
3) Information	Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) //Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- Claims 1, 2, 10, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tu et al (US 5971968). Tu discloses a catheter probe for treating atrial fibrillation comprising the a rigid probe 1 having an ablation electrode 11 at the distal end, the electrode having an opening 74 that allows irrigation fluid to flow through an infusion tube 54 and out of the electrode (Col. 3, lines 56-60, Col. 10, lines 23-27). The probe is torsionally rigid (Col. 5, lines 8-15). Tu further discloses that the device comprises a hollow handle 6. Tu discloses that the probe has a temperature sensing means (Col. 4, lines 38-39). The tip electrode may be porous (Col. 6, lines 66-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 3, 7, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tu in view of Alt (US 5411527). Claims 3,7,17 differ from Tu in calling for the probe to include a stiffening wire. Alt teaches a device for treating atrial fibrillation comprising a probe having a stiffening wire 30 that straightens and stiffens the tube sufficiently to be

passed through a puncture in the chest wall (Col. 15, lines 37-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Tu to include a stiffening wire in the probe as taught by Alt so that the probe is straight and stiff enough to be inserted through a puncture in the chest wall.

Page 3

- 5. Claims 4-6, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tu in view of Alt as applied to claims 3 and 7 above, and further in view of Sterman et al (US 5682906). Claims 4-6, 14-16 differ from the teachings above in calling for the probe to be of a certain length. Sterman teaches a method for performing intracardiac procedures using a probe that is about 20 cm (7.87 inches) because that is the length allows the probe to reach the heart so that a procedure can be performed and is not so long that the physician has difficulty controlling it (Col. 24, lines 15-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Tu in view of Alt to be about 20 cm long as taught by Sterman so that the probe is of an appropriate length to treat the heart.
- 6. Claims 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tu in view of Alt as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Lucas et al (US 5795332). Claim 8 differs from the teachings above in calling for the stiffening wire to be stainless steel. Claim 9 differs in calling for the wire to be a malleable material. Lucas teaches a catheter having a stiffening wire made of stainless steel (a malleable metal) to provide the desired rigidity to the catheter (Col. 6, lines 44-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of

Tu in view of Alt to have the stiffening wire made of stainless steel because it is well

known in the art that stainless steel can be used to form stiffening wires.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 9/4/07 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

8. Applicant argues that Tu fails to disclose a generally rigid probe body. In

response, the examiner points applicant to column 5, lines 8-15 of the Tu disclosure

wherein it is disclosed that the shaft has a torsional rigidity. Therefore, it is the

examiner's interpretation that this shaft is a generally rigid probe as required by the

claims, as it is rigid with respect to torsional movement.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Application/Control Number: 10/747,774

Art Unit: 3763

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Laura A. Bouchelle whose telephone number is 571-272-

2125. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 517-272-4977. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laura A Bouchelle Examiner

Page 5

Art Unit 3763